

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Amelia Anne Greene-Major,)	
)	C/A No. 3:10-1459-MBS-JRM
Plaintiff,)	
)	
vs.)	
)	ORDER
Commissioner of Social Security)	
Administration; Mrs. Margaret Howle;)	
Mrs. L. Williams; Mrs. L. Jenkins; Mrs.)	
Ashley; Mrs. Barbara Moore; Mrs. Quientie)	
or Quienthe Wilson; Mr. Jay Campbell;)	
Mr. Hartwell; Mr. Gaillard,)	
)	
Defendants.)	
_____)	

Plaintiff Amelia Anne Green-Major, proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis, brings this action to appeal the denial of social security benefits. Plaintiff brings this action against Defendant Commissioner of the Social Security Administration and nine individuals who allegedly were employed by the Commissioner and presumably involved with the decision to terminate Plaintiff's benefits. Plaintiff seeks reinstatement of benefits, money damages, and other relief.

In accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) and Local Rule 73.02, D.S.C., this matter was referred to United States Magistrate Judge Joseph R. McCrorey for pretrial handling. The Magistrate Judge issued a Report and Recommendation on June 17, 2010 in which he noted that the Social Security Act precludes actions against officers or employees of the Social Security Administration. Accordingly, the Magistrate Judge recommended that the complaint be dismissed as to the nine individual Defendants for failure to state a claim upon which relief may be granted. Plaintiff filed objections to Report and Recommendation on June 17, 2010.

The Magistrate Judge makes only a recommendation to this court. The recommendation has

no presumptive weight. The responsibility for making a final determination remains with this court. Mathews v. Weber, 423 U.S. 261, 270 (1976). The court is charged with making a de novo determination of any portions of the Report and Recommendation to which a specific objection is made. The court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendation made by the Magistrate Judge or may recommit the matter to the Magistrate Judge with instructions. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1).

In her objections, Plaintiff essentially reiterates the allegations of her complaint as to the manner in which she was treated by many of the individual Defendants. The district court need not conduct a de novo review when a party makes only general and conclusory objections that do not direct the court to a specific error in the Magistrate Judge's proposed findings and recommendations. Orpiano v. Johnson, 687 F.2d 44, 47-48 (4th Cir. 1982).

Nevertheless, the court has thoroughly examined the record. The court adopts the Report of and Recommendation and incorporates it herein by reference. The complaint is dismissed as against the nine individual Defendants. The case is recommitted to the Magistrate Judge for further pretrial handling.¹

IT IS SO ORDERED.

/s/ Margaret B. Seymour
United States District Judge

Columbia, South Carolina

July 29, 2010.

¹ The court notes that Plaintiff has executed a Notice, Consent, and Reference of a Civil Action to a Magistrate Judge. (Entry 13)